DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 120 UD 020 020

AUTHOR	Dederick, Judith Garrettson: And Others
TITLE	Follow Through Program 1977-1978. Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Div. of Educational Planning and Support.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 78
NOTE	72p.: Evaluation completed by the Center for School Development in consultation with the Office of Educational Evaluation
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement: *Compensatory Education Programs: Early Childhood Education; Health Services: *Parent Attitudes: Program Evaluation: *Self Esteem: Student Ability: Student School Relationship: *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I: *Follow Through Program: New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The report evaluates the Follow Through Program in New York City, a federally-funded early childhood program with wide-ranging services and extensive goals. This evaluation considers not only the academic achievement of students in this program but also factors such as classroom dynamics, teacher attitudes, children's self-esteem, and parental perceptions. It reports that the results of the Follow Through program were largely successful, in that students involved had positive school experiences and generally matched or exceeded the normative rate of academic growth. It is also reported that teachers and parents reacted favorably to the program. Appendices include evaluation instruments and data and analysis tables supplementary to the ones given in the main body of the text. (Author/WP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDPS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HECS -

COPY I

EVALUATION REPORT_____

ED181120

FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM 1977-1978

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I

Budget Code 5009 Project Number 81672

United States Office of Education Grant

Budget Code 5021 Project Number 87701

prepared by:

Judith Garrettson Dederick, Ph.D.,

Harry J. Clawar, Ph.D.,

and

Warren E. Dederick, Ed.D.

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Pl 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1977-78 school year.

Board of Education of the City of New York
Division of Educational Planning and Support
Center for School Development

in consultation with
Office of Educational Evaluation

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AUGUST 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ron Edmonds
New York City Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD020020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
CHAPTER ONE	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background	1
	The Programs	2
TWO	METHODOLOGY	10
	Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Reading Scores	17
	Comparison of Achievement Between Pupils with Complete and Partial Follow Through Experience	20
	Rates of Growth from Program to Program	21
	Rate of Growth Compared to National Norms	22
	Results of the Classroom Observations and Relationships with Growth in Reading	22
	Results of the Teacher Questionnaire and Relationships with Growth in Reading	25
	Results of the Second Grade Inventory	27
	Results of the Study of Health Services	29
	Results of the Parent Questionnaire	32
FOUR	DISCUSSION	37
FIVE	RECOMMENDATIONS	41
	The Direct Instruction Model Site	42
	The Bank Street Model Site	43
	The Behavior Analysis Model - Site A - 10 Classes	44
	The Behavior Analysis Model - Site B, 8 Classes	44

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

		Page
	The Cognitively Oriented Curriculum Model Site	45
	The Home-School Partnership Model Site	46
	The Self-Sponsored Model Site	47
	The Interdependent Learning Model Site	47
APPENDIX A	CLASS AND PUPIL EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS	49
B	ADDITIONAL DATA ANALYSIS TABLES	55

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The Follow Through Program in New York City is a federally-funded early childhood program with wide-ranging services and extensive goals. This evaluation is focused on several different aspects of the program in an attempt to assess the implementation and effectiveness of its various components. In addition to the academic achievement of Follow Through pupils, this evaluation encompasses classroom dynamics, teacher's experiences and attitudes, children's self-esteem, pupil health services, and parents' perceptions of the program.

The original designers of Follow Through proposed that a research goal could also be realized if the program were to employ varied educational models in its various sites. Thus, in the eight puplic school sites in New York City, seven widely divergent models are in use. Therefore, in addition to an overall evaluation of the program, the strengths and weaknesses of the various models as they are implemented in their respective sites will be discussed.

Background

Follow Through is administered through the Division of Educational Planning and Support, Center for School Development of the New York City Board of Education. In addition, each site has a full-time Coordinator, a Follow Through nurse, and a variety of other staff members either part- or full-time. At each site there is an active Family Room, where parents gather before school begins in the morning as well as throughout the day. Each site has as part of its annual budget an allocation for parent and parent-child activities, and the health

and social services components of the program also involve the parents as much as possible. For the classroom, Follow Through provides funds for paraprofessionals (one full-time para per class in most programs), snacks, trips, and all kinds of supplies and materials. Where the educational model includes parent aides in the classroom, funds for training stipends for the parent aides are supplied.

At each site, staff development is a major emphasis: at least one full-time staff developer is at each of seven sites, and at the eighth, there are funds for consultants for staff development. Much as the extra staff and materials provided by Follow Through sound like limitless riches to teachers in New York who have no supplementary funding, Follow Through teachers and staff members are quick to cite the drastic budget cuts which the program has sustained over recent years. Originally, there were more staff members, especially more paraprofessionals, psychologists, and social workers, and they are sorely missed by everyone, including Follow Through parents. Similarly, budget allocations for books, supplies, and trips have been markedly reduced.

The Programs

The Direct Instruction Model includes the use of Distar instructional materials. As implemented here, children work in small groups with adults on cognitive material which heavily emphasizes drill in reading, arithmetic, and language skills. In most classes, there is one group with a teacher, another with a paraprofessional, a third group with a "language assistant", and a fourth group doing seatwork. The teacher's behaviors are closely structured in this model, and

children often respond in unison. Thus, it is not unusual to enter a classroom in which one group is reciting in reading, another in language skills, and another in arithmetic. Children are taught to respond in unison, and they are apparently able to attend to the activities of their own group and screen out the sounds from other groups. The model emphasizes speed and continuous attention, and children work hard and enjoy their accomplishments. This is a "behavior modification" model, in which teachers' verbal rewards and children's recognition of their own accomplishments are to function as reinforcers. The pace in these classrooms is very fast, but the children do not show signs of stress. Since the curriculum is highly structured and the pace is prescribed, most of the school day is spent in the above-described activities. Frequent tests, the results of which are sent to the model sponsor at the University of Oregon for analysis, let both teachers and children know how they are progressing.

This program is in a large old school in District 23. There are 12 classes, each with a full-time paraprofessional, 3 paraprofessional language assistants, who "float" according to a fixed schedule among the kindergarten, first, and second grade classes, and one paraprofessional who does the individual testing prescribed by the model.

The Bank Street Model is based on the philosophy of the Bank Street College, which is the model sponsor. This model emphasizes an open classroom environment with a large number of learning and activity centers which are focused on social studies related to the

children's experience. Classrooms are to be rich with books and materials, and children are given a great deal of latitude to choose their daily activities. Each child is to spend some time each day in reading and arithmetic, and the teacher divides his or her time between working with small groups in reading and circulating among the activity centers facilitating the learning which is going on there. The paraprofessionals' roles are similar to the teachers'. The model proposes that children develop optimally if they are in rich environments with ample opportunities to explore and raise questions; there is thus a heavy emphasis on language development through these experiences. In the same vein, many trips are scheduled, and activity and experience charts line classroom walls. Creative work, especially drawing and painting, is an integral part of the curriculum.

This program is in a relatively modern school across the street from a large housing project in District 16. It is the largest of the Follow Through programs in New York City, with 19 classes and 23 paraprofessionals, as well as 3 full-time staff developers. This program was nationally validated and has established a Follow Through Resource Center (funded by USOE) for dissemination.

The Behavior Analysis Model is based in two sites in New York City. The model is based on classical behavior modification principles, in which correct behavior is rewarded, and incorrect behavior is ignored. In the classroom, the children are in three permanent groups, each group with its desks arranged together. Each group is guided by an adult, one by the teacher, one by the paraprofessional, and the third

by a trained parent. Time is divided into "earn" periods, in which children can earn tokens through correct behavior (including working well and giving good answers), and "spend" periods, in which each child cashes in his or her tokens to purchase an activity of his or her choice. The more popular activities cost more tokens, and tokens are liberally distributed so that each child has at least some tokens to use in each "spend" period. Children work individually at all times, using programmed workbooks. The functions of the adult in each group are to show the child how far he or she is to work in the workbook, thus setting a goal, to correct finished work, to answer questions and help when a child is "stuck", and to distribute tokens, telling the child exactly why he or she is receiving a token at each particular time. Children whose behavior is disruptive to others are separated from the group, and thus from the opportunity to earn or spend tokens, for a short "time out". At the beginning of each "earn" period, the adults change groups. The lengths of time spent in "earn" and "spend" are varied according to the ages of the children, with longer "earns" for older children. By the end of the third grade, when the program is phased out, the teachers have gradually changed their reward systems so that first checkmarks on a piece of paper, and later verbal praise alone, are to function as rewards instead of tokens.

As noted above, the Behavior Analysis Model is in use in two sites. At one site, the program is in a relatively new annex to a large old school. There, there are 8 classes, each with a para-

professional and a parent trainee. The parents serve for 40 days, so each class has a number of parents over the course of a year. This program has the annex building almost exclusively to itself. This program also has established a Follow Through Resource Center. At the other Behavior Analysis site, 10 classes are distributed widely within a large old school building. The arrangements of paraprofessionals and parent aides are the same as at the first site. The neighborhoods are similar.

The Cognitively Oriented Curriculum Model is based on Piaget's descriptions and theoretical hypotheses about how cognitive development proceeds. The model suggests that children in the early childhood grades learn about their worlds by interacting and experimenting with them, guided as often as possible by the skillful questions of an adult. The adult's questions are emphatically not supposed to lead the child to an answer, for a child's answer to a question may be different than an adult's would be. Rather, the adult's (in this case, the teacher's) questions are to be designed to get the child to consider all aspects of a situation, to test hypotheses, to notice contradictions, and to formulate conclusions. The classroom is to include many activity centers, each with many different things for children to do; ideally, each center includes activities for children at many different cognitive levels, so that each child has at least one challenging activity available at each center. Each child is to plan his activities at the beginning of the day, write out his plan, then carry it out, recording what he is doing and learning along the way, and then at the end of the day to evaluate what he has done,

again in writing. The teacher's functions are to help the children choose activities, do the kind of questioning described above, generally supervise activities, and keep accurate records of the progress and activities of each child, so that at any time he or she car suggest an activity to a child which is at the proper level for that child.

This model is located in a medium-sized elementary school in District 5. There are 11 classes, each with a paraprofessional.

The Home-School Partnership Model is based on the hypothesis that children will be most likely to reach high achievement levels if the school and the home work cooperatively, presenting the child with coordinated experiences in which family members and teachers back each other up by presenting related and inter-connected learning situations. Thus, in this model it is prescribed that a "home teacher", in this case a paraprofessional, function as a liaison between the classroom and the home, spending approximately half of her time in each setting. At this site, the home teachers work with the teachers in classrooms in the morning, and after lunch they make visits to the children's homes, demonstrating learning materials and experiences for the children to the parents. The home teachers are also to bring materials to the parents, and teach them how to find or make inexpensive educational materials themselves. There is no specific classroom instruction model for the teachers; each teacher is to follow the curricula of the school.

This model site is in a medium-sized elementary school in District 5. There are 13 Follow Through classes in the school, each with a paraprofessional.

The Self-Sponsored Model does not have a model sponsor and thus has evolved its own program, which could best be described as a modified open classroom approach, with the children spending some time in learning centers and some time in more traditional large or small instructional groups being "taught" a specified lesson. A curriculum consultant is provided for in the program budget, and is hired to come in and give workshops, develop curriculum materials, and address particular problems voiced by the teachers.

There are 9 classes at this site, each with a teacher and a paraprofessional. The school (in District 2) is relatively modern, and children in this Follow Through model come from a greater diversity of ethnic backgrounds than do children in other Follow Through models.

The Interdependent Learning Model was originally based on Gotkin's theory of learning through games, which included a great deal of peer teaching. When Dr. Gotkin died, the program went through a long period of turmoil because the model was not fully developed. It has evolved, with the help of a new sponsor, into a model with a continued heavy emphasis on games and peer teaching. The classrooms are organized into areas, where children are to interact with children in learning situations. At the same time, a highly structured reading program, the Direct Approach to Decoding or DAD program, has been introduced. Thus, the children spend part of their time each day in activities in the learning centers which they have chosen with the teacher's supervision, and part of the day in a small reading group with the teacher. One of

the teacher's major responsibilities, along with teaching reading and generally supervising the classroom, is to keep recorsd of the activities of each child each day.

The model site is in a relatively modern, medium-sized elementary school in District 3. There are 10 Follow Through classes, each with a teacher and paraprofessional.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY & RESULTS

In the evaluation design of the 1977-78 Follow Through proposal, eight evaluation objectives were formulated:

1) Using the U.S.O.E. Model A, pre and post reading test percentile ranks for grades K-3 were converted to normal curve equivalents (i.e., mean = 50 and Standard Deviation = 21), and compared by use of the correlated t-test.

2) Follow Through students (i.e., in grade 3 as of 1977-78, who had four full years of Follow Through experience, were compared to Follow Through students who did not have the full four program years.

3) Follow Through pupils for whom pre-and post-test scores were available from the beginning of grade 1 to the end of grade 3 were studied to evaluate rates of growth from program to program year by year.

4) The same pupil population as in Objective 3, combined across programs, was evaluated in relation to national norms, to ascertain whether the children advanced in relative standings year by year.

5) Trained observers with professional credentials in psychology, early childhood education and curriculum development and supervision of instruction observed the children and teachers in the K-3 Follow Through classes, and interviewed the teachers individually. In order to obtain information beyond the scope of the above test data, information from the observations

and interviews (see sample in Appendix A) were matched with student test data. Thus, for each child, his achievement test scores were recorded along with ratings of the effectiveness of instruction, the teacher's use of the Follow Through instructional model, the teacher's satisfaction with Follow Through, and so on. Then, by using Pearson Product-Moment correlations, relationships between teacher and classroom factors with student growth in reading were examined.

The Classroom Observation Schedule and Check List was developed and used beginning in 1976-77 (see Appendix A) to evaluate the implementation of the Follow Through educational models in the classrooms and also to evaluate the overall effectiveness of instruction, the way the children were spending their time, and the quality of the classroom environments. The teachers were notified that an observer would be in their classrooms sometime during the day. Virtually all observations were made in the morning. The observer entered each class, asked the teacher if it was a convenient time for an observation, and if so, seated himself or herself in a place in the classroom from which he or she could see as much of the class as possible. Each observation lasted approximately 30 minutes.

Counts of numbers of children working were made three times at 5 minute intervals. Three samples were taken in an effort to capture a reliable estimate of the average number of children who could be expected to be at work at any time in each class. It should be noted that it was not possible for the observer to ascertain, for each child

at each time, whether he or she was doing exactly what he or she was supposed to be doing. Children counted as "working" were all those who were occupied with an activity which seemed to the observer to be appropriate. This included, of course, children who were occupied in "play" activities who were expected to do so. Children counted as "not working" were all those who were daydreaming, talking or playing with each other who were not supposed to be doing so, wandering around the room, sitting with their heads down, and so on. The few children counted as "indeterminate" were usually in transition between activities.

The teachers and paraprofessionals were rated on their adherence to the instructional techniques prescribed by their programs' models where the models included specific instructional procedures. Thus, these ratings were made in the schools using the Bank Street, Direct Instruction, Behavior Analysis, Cognitively Oriented Curriculum, and Interdependent Learning models. If the teacher or para adhered to the model at all times during the observation, he or she was rated as "adheres to model throughout". If he or she adhered to the model most of the time, or adhered to all but one relatively minor aspect of the model, the rating "usually adheres to model" was used. If the teacher or para made some attempts to use the model, but most of the teaching was not according to it, the rating was "sometimes adheres to model". The meaning of the rating "never adheres to model" is self-evident.

The effectiveness of instruction ("outstanding", "very good", "average", or "below average") was rated regardless of the teacher's adherence to the Follow Through instructional model. This rating was

based on the appropriateness of the lesson(s) observed, the skill with which the teaching was done, and the teacher's motivating the children and making their learning meaningful. Most of the time, and especially when instruction was rated "below average", this evaluation was checked with the Follow Through Coordinator and/or the school principal. The observer and the school official(s) agreed on all of the ratings.

The quality of the classroom environment rating ("outstanding", "very good", "average", or "below average") was made on the basis of the educational richness and attractiveness of the classrooms. The fact that some models prescribe more materials in classrooms and some prescribe fewer was taken into account.

The Teacher Questionnaire (see Appendix A) was conducted in private with each individual teacher. Each teacher was given the interviewer's personal assurance that he or she would not be quoted by name to anyone and that none of the teacher's comments or feelings would be attributed to him or her in discussions with Follow Through Coordinators. In other words, conficentiality was assured and, of course, maintained. The questions were asked exactly as they appear on the interview schedule, and the teachers' responses were recorded verbatim. Each interview lasted between 20 and 30 minutes.

6) In order to evaluate pupils' self-esteem, a randomly selected sample of Follow Through second grade pupils completed the Second Grade Inventory (see Appendix A) at each site. The self-esteem scores were correlated with academic achievement.

The Second Grade Inventory was developed as a synthesis of the literature on self-esteem inventories for young children, the objectives of this evaluation, and the needs of inner-city children. The Inventory was approved by the Follow Through Coordinators, the City-Wide Parents' Advisory Committee, and the Office of Educational Evaluation of the New York City Board of Education. At each site, 16 boys and 16 girls were randomly selected from the second graders who had been in Follow Through from the beginning of grade 1 or earlier. A female research associate with professional credentials in child psychology administered the instrument to the children in single-sex groups of 4 to 8 in a small private room.

At the beginning of each administration, the children were put at ease and were then instructed that they were about to be asked for their opinions or feelings about some questions. It was emphasized that this was not a test, that there were no right or wrong answers, that since opinions were being asked for different children would give different answers, and that their answers would all remain confidential.

The children were then instructed to begin with the side of the answer sheet labelled The Classroom and Me, and to listen to each of the ten statements read by the interviewer. For each statement, the child was to circle YES if he or she thought the statement was like him-or-herself, and NO if not. A practice question was given verbally first and discussed, and each question was read twice, each time with the interviewer repeating, "Is this like you? Circle YES if it is

like you, and circle NO if it is not."

The same procedure was followed with the second side of the answer sheet, entitled Children in School. The child heard a statement about a child in another school and was asked to circle YES if he or she wanted to be like that child and NO if not. The names attributed to the "children in another school" were specifically chosen so that they could be either boys or girls. Thus, when a group of boys was completing the Inventory, the interviewer said, "Zoe is a boy in another school ... (etc.)," and when girls were the subjects, she said, "Zoe is a girl in another school ..."

Each child's Inventory was scored by comparing each item on side 1 to its corresponding item on side 2. If the answers were the same, i.e., either both were "yes" or both were "no," the item received one point, since there was no divergence between perceived self-image (i.e., "I am a good reader") and idealized self ("Zoe is a good reader. Do you want to be like Zoe?") Thus, the maximum score was 10.

7) In order to determine the extent of the health services received by Follow Through children in comparison to other New York City public school children, extensive data on health services were collected. Follow Through health services were obtained from the Follow Through nurses' annual reports, an interview with each Follow Through nurse, and on-site examination of Follow Through health records. Information about the following services was

obtained: for hearing, vision, and dental needs, complete information was gathered regarding screening, referral, follow-up, and average time between referral and follow-up for the children in each program; numbers of complete physical examinations, including blood tests; numbers and frequencies of agency contacts; and other services such as parent-nurse conferences, teacher-nurse conferences, and parent health workshops. Data on the health services available to other New York City public school children were collected from the records of the New York City Public Health Service.

8) Parents' perceptions of the Follow Through program were elicited through the Follow Through Parent Questionnaire (see Table 8). The Parent Questionnaire was developed in consultation with the Follow Through coordinators and PAC chairpersons, and was approved by the City-Wide PAC. Copies of the Questionnaire in English and in Spanish were distributed to the parents by the staff of each program, and every effort was made to have them returned. Of 1500 Questionnaires distributed, 416 in English and 89 in Spanish were returned, totalling 505. The major topics of the Questionnaire were: participation in children's classrooms, participation in other school activities, use of family services offered by Follow Through, attendance at parent workships, attendance in adult education with help

from Follow Through, and attitudes about the effectiveness of Follow Through. Since the Questionnaire was anonymous and was returned voluntarily, we assume that the sample was not randomly representative of all Follow Through parents.

Results

The results are presented in eight sections reflecting the eight objectives stated in the beginning of this chapter.

Comparison of pre- and post-test reading scores

Table 1 indicates the pre- and post-test reading scores, program by program, for children in grades K through 3. Differences are evaluated in terms of correlated t-tests.

In order for a child to achieve the same normal curve equivalent (NCE) or percentile score on a post-test as he did on the pre-test, he must in fact grow academically at the same rate as the national norm group. Such a rate of growth is not typically observed in inner-city schools. Table 1 includes 88 separate pre- to post-test comparisions. In 74 of those, the children matched or exceeded the normative rate of growth, as indicated by either significantly greater-than-normal change or by the absence of significant pre-to post-test differences. Although 14 comparisons indicate slower-than-normal growth, 17 show faster-than-normal development.

TABLE 1

FOLLOW THROUGH 1977-78 PRE POST SCORES (IN U.S.O.E. NORMAL-CURVE EQUIVALENTS) BY PROGRAM

		GRADE										
		K		1			2			3		
School† Model		Letters	Aural	Letters	Aural	Sentences	Vocab.	Comp.	W.S.S.	Vocab.	Comp.	W.S.S.
	Pre	45.3	37.1	51.8	32.9	66.0	32.6	45.3	52.9	30.0	38.6	37.4
	Post	51.5	48.7	50.2	36.9	54.7	34.1	50.1	49.7	31.9	36.5	33.9
D.I.M.	t	2.01*	4.58***	-.63	1.94	-5.47***	1.01	2.74**	-3.26**	1.90	-2.68**	-3.16**
	n	48	48	84	84	84	79	83	81	78	78	78
	Pre	59.3	41.6	46.4	43.4	49.5	38.8	47.5	48.6	42.8	45.1	42.9
	Post	60.5	38.6	49.7	46.1	49.7	37.0	49.0	48.8	44.9	46.3	46.9
B.S.M.	t	.47	-1.21	1.89	1.58	.10	-2.07*	1.54	.12	2.11*	1.37	3.94***
	n	49	46	112	109	110	147	146	114	115	113	114
	Pre	59.9	37.2	44.1	33.4	61.2	33.9	41.3	43.3	26.9	32.0	29.6
	Post	68.1	64.4	43.5	38.7	43.4	30.8	44.6	41.8	29.6	33.0	29.9
B.A.M.	t	2.77**	5.22***	-.24	2.11*	-5.29***	-2.14*	1.68	-.80	1.28	.78	.23
	n	31	31	49	49	47	72	69	72	60	60	61
	Pre	69.8	35.9	50.7	37.4	60.5	37.4	51.9	56.4	35.6	39.2	34.5
	Post	65.7	35.7	43.9	33.9	47.6	35.3	50.4	51.7	36.9	43.2	37.9
B.A.M.	t	-1.79	-.08	-3.08**	-1.67	-4.40***	-1.04	-.82	-3.01**	.96	2.61*	1.41
	n	40	40	52	52	51	61	61	61	56	56	56

†See introductory text for model description.
*p ≤ .05
**p ≤ .01
***p ≤ .001
Grade K = Stanford Early School Achievement Test - Level I
Grade 1 = Stanford Early School Achievement Test - Level II
Grade 2 = Stanford Achievement Test - Primary I
Grade 3 = Stanford Achievement Test - Primary II

D.I.M. = Direct Instruction Model
B.S.M. = Bank Street Model
B.A.M. = Behavior Analysis Model (2 sites)
C.O.C. = Cognitively Oriented Curriculum
H.S.P. = Home-School Partnership
S.S.M. = Self-Sponsored Model
I.L.M. = Interdependent Learning Model

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

GRADE

School Model		K		1			2			3		
		Letters	Aural	Letters	Aural	Sentences	Vocab.	Comp.	W.S.S.	Vocab.	Comp.	W.S.S.
	Pre	51.0	34.9	44.5	38.1	46.3	36.6	38.2	42.6	38.0	39.4	37.2
	Post	47.0	40.6	44.3	42.3	43.5	38.5	44.4	40.1	36.2	37.4	36.4
C.O.C.	t	-1.11	2.13*	-.14	1.91	-1.15	1.20	4.17***	-1.32	-1.15	-1.79	-.23
	n	41	41	75	74	75	70	71	71	78	76	77
	Pre	65.5	45.8	41.0	35.5	51.0	39.5	40.8	46.7	37.4	38.0	37.7
	Post	62.1	49.4	40.8	31.6	41.0	38.4	47.1	46.0	41.8	38.5	40.6
H.S.P.	t	-1.43	1.43	-.07	-2.03*	-3.95***	-1.00	3.72***	-.46	2.80**	.33	2.56*
	n	43	42	68	67	67	75	77	78	69	61	71
	Pre	56.6	38.0	44.6	35.3	46.5	34.6	41.9	41.7	41.2	45.1	38.7
	Post	57.9	42.0	46.9	36.2	34.4	34.0	44.9	42.6	37.8	48.2	40.0
S.S.M.	t	.51	1.69	.70	.36	-2.84**	-.38	1.84	.50	-1.94	2.13*	.76
	n	43	43	48	46	30	72	72	72	48	48	49
	Pre	51.8	33.6	50.4	34.2	47.1	35.0	49.6	52.6	34.2	40.5	36.8
	Post	60.1	40.4	41.9	34.1	47.3	34.6	49.7	53.4	33.4	39.8	35.5
I.L.M.	t	3.21**	2.06*	-2.79**	-.08	.11	-.23	.06	.38	-.30	-.71	-.73
	n	33	34	39	39	35	46	44	47	52	51	51

Comparison of achievement between pupils with complete and partial Follow Through experience

A group of 160 third grade pupils who had four full years of Follow Through experience and for whom complete reading achievement data were available was compared with a group of 49 third grade children who had been in Follow Through for less than four years. Although the analysis of variance showed no significant difference between the two groups, it should be noted that the criterion "less than four years in Follow Through" includes children who were in Follow Through for as many as 3 1/2 years.

TABLE 2

MEAN READING SCALED-SCORES FOR FOLLOW THROUGH STUDENTS WHO WERE IN THE PROGRAM FOR THE FULL FOUR YEARS AND THOSE IN THE PROGRAM FOR LESS THAN FOUR YEARS

		TIME IN PROGRAM	
GRADE & TEST		LT 4YR	FULL 4 YRS
PRE GRADE 1 Letters & Sounds	MEAN	82.020	81.000
PRE GRADE 2 Reading Comprehension	MEAN	108.122	111.400
PRE GRADE 3 Reading Comprehension	MEAN	123.796	126.275
POST GRADE 3 Reading Comprehension	MEAN	132.000	134.181
	N	49.000	160.000

Rates of growth from program to program

Table 3 shows the mean scores for those third grade children for whom complete test data were available from the grade 1 pre-test through the third grade post-test. The data are separated according to program. The data indicate that, although the analysis of variance for main effects is significant by grade and not by program, there is also a significant interaction effect. Thus, the children in D.I.M., B.A.M.(2), C.O.C., H.S.P. and S.S.M. Program Types progressed faster from pre-grade 1 to 2 than the children did in B.S.M. and B.A.M. (1). From pre-grade 2 to pre-grade 3, faster growth occurred among the pupils of B.S.M., B.A.M.(1), C.O.C., H.S.P. and S.S.M. The children in all of the schools progressed at the same rate from the grade 3 pre-test to the grade 3 post-test.

TABLE 3

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCALED SCORES (STANDARD SCORES COMPARABLE ACROSS TEST LEVELS FOR A GIVEN CONTENT AREA) FOR THE EIGHT PROGRAM TYPES FOR 4 TESTING PERIODS

PROGRAM TYPE		PRE GR1 LTRS & SOUND	PRE GR2 READ. COMP.	PRE GR3 READ. COMP.	POST GR3 READ. COMP.
DIM	MEAN	74.114	113.924	124.219	131.807
BSM	MEAN	98.017	108.378	129.715	138.942
BAM	MEAN	94.411	100.616	117.893	125.366
BAM	MEAN	80.889	112.422	126.586	134.611
COC	MEAN	73.688	102.971	123.029	131.644
HSP	MEAN	73.944	104.361	125.806	129.750
SSM	MEAN	74.000	111.000	127.050	137.200
ILM	MEAN	73.925	107.225	120.900	128.125
	MEAN*	80.373	107.612	124.400	132.181

*Means are unweighted averages of cell means.

Rate of growth compared to national norms

As shown in Table 4, the 209 children from all programs for whom complete reading comprehension data are available advanced more quickly than the national norm group from pre-grade 2 to pre-grade 3, and stayed at the normative growth rate during third grade. (The data from the grade 1 pre-test were not included here, as the test assessed letter and sound recognition rather than reading comprehension.)

TABLE 4

READING COMPREHENSION FROM GRADE 2 PRE-TEST TO GRADE 3 POST-TEST (N=209)

GRADE	2 PRE-TEST	3 PRE-TEST	3 POST-TEST
SAT Scaled Score	110.632	125.694	133.670
Normal Curve Equiv.	37.1	40.1	40.1

Results of the classroom observations and relationships with growth in reading.

Five kinds of information were collected during the classroom observations: three time samples of numbers of children working and not working, adherence of the teacher to the Follow Through instructional model, adherence of the para to the model, effectiveness of instruction regardless of the teachers' adherence to the model, and quality of classroom environment. (See Appendix A for Classroom Observation Schedule.) Tables presenting the complete data, which are summarized below, appear in Appendix B.

Across the time samples, an average of 85% of the pupils were observed to be working. (See Tables 9, 10 and 11 in Appendix B.)

The range of observations was represented at the higher limit by the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum model school, where an average of 93% working was observed, and, at the lower end of the distribution, the larger Behavior Analysis Model school, where the average was 77%. As indicated in Table 24 correlations between percentage of students working and gain in reading scores tended to be very close to zero for all four grades.

A large proportion of the teachers and paraprofessionals adhered to the instructional models prescribed by their Follow Through models. (See Tables 12 and 13. Note that the Home-School Partnership Model does not have an instructional model, as discussed in Chapter 1.) The schools at which the greatest numbers were in classes where teachers were observed to be teaching as prescribed (on the Observation Schedule, rated "usually" or "always" adhering) were the Self-Sponsored (100%) and Interdependent Learning Model (100%) sites. At the lower end of the distribution was the larger Behavior Analysis Model school (74% adhering).

The schools at which the largest proportions of children were in classes where paraprofessionals were rated as "always" or "usually" adhering to the models were the Interdependent Learning Model (100%) and the smaller Behavior Analysis site (100%). At the lower end of the range was the larger Behavior Analysis Model (63%).

Perhaps because of the very high levels of adherence to the models among all schools, there were no significant correlations between teacher or paraprofessional adherence and pupil reading achievement.

A large proportion of children was in classes in which the effectiveness of instruction was rated "outstanding" or "very good." (See Table 14 in Appendix B.) The school at which the greatest proportion of pupils was in classes with effective instruction was the Home-School Partnership site (85%). At two of the schools, a significantly large proportion of children was in classes in which the effectiveness of instruction was rated "below average" or "average." They were the Interdependent Learning (39.5%) and the smaller Behavior Analysis (37.4%) sites.

Again the overall percentage of children in classes with effective instruction was high, so that little variability existed for correlational studies and in fact no significant correlations between pupil achievement and effectiveness of instruction were found.

A large proportion of the children was in classes in which the quality of the classroom environment was rated "outstanding" or "very good." (See Table 15, Appendix B.) The school at which the greatest proportion of pupils was in classes with the highest quality of classroom environment was the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum site (100%). At the other (i.e., lower) extreme was the larger Behavior Analysis site with 31% of the children in classroom environments rated "outstanding" or "very good."

On balance, a large majority of the children was in classrooms with a high quality of environment rating. Therefore, it was to be expected that correlations with achievement would not be significantly different from zero, and again, they were not.

Results of the Teacher Questionnaire and relationships with growth in reading

The Teacher Questionnaire covered teaching experience (years in Follow Through and total years), teachers' desire to be in Follow Through both at time of appointment and at present, teachers' experiences of orientation to Follow Through, teachers' hours in inservice training in Follow Through, average frequencies of use of Follow Through Resource Rooms and school libraries, and anonymous general comments.

The average Follow Through teacher has 12.6 years of teaching experience (see Table 16, Appendix B), of which 4.4 years have been in Follow Through. The school with the most experienced teachers was the smaller Behavior Analysis site, where average total experience was 15.6 years. The school with least experienced teachers was the Bank Street site, where average total experience is 9.4 years.

In terms of years in Follow Through (see Table 17, Appendix B), the Interdependent Learning Model site has the most senior teachers, who average 6.0 years in the program, and the smaller Behavior Analysis site has the least experienced Follow Through teachers (2.5 years), although those same teachers have the greatest number of total years of teaching.

There was no correlation between years of experience, either overall or in Follow Through, and pupil achievement.

Although the teachers had very mixed feelings about being in Follow Through when they were originally appointed to the program,

their response to the program in the Spring of 1978 was highly positive (81.4%). In two schools, the smaller Behavior Analysis and the Self-Sponsored sites, 100% of the teachers originally wanted to be in Follow Through. By contrast, at the Home-School Partnership site, only 18% would have elected to be in the program initially. (However, 75% of those teachers said they would now choose to stay in Follow Through.) The school at which 100% of the teachers said they would now choose to stay in the program was at the Self-Sponsored Model site. At the other end of the distribution, 56% of the teachers at the Interdependent Learning Model site said they would now stay in Follow Through if given a choice. Once again, there was no correlation between these teacher attitudes toward the program and pupil achievement.

On the average, across all model sites, 70.4% of teachers who were interviewed said that they had received orientation prior to starting in the program. This ranged from a low of 55.6% (B.A.M.1) and 58.3% (H.S.P) to a high of 87.5% (B.A.M.2) of teachers interviewed. There were no significant correlations between whether or not a student's teacher had such an orientation and his gains in any of the reading measures.

There was a wide range of amounts of inservice training taken by the teachers over the years of their Follow Through experience. In general, the amount of inservice instruction, on a school-by-school basis, corresponded very closely with the numbers of years the teachers had spent in Follow Through. (The only exception was

at the Home-School Partnership site, where the teachers ranked second in Follow Through seniority and seventh in amounts of in-service training. Since this model has no instructional model for the teachers, this finding could be expected.) Throughout Follow Through, 25% of the teachers reported 0 to 14 hours of inservice training, 25% report 3 to 10 days of training, and 50% report from 2 to 4 or more weeks of study. (See Table 21, Appendix B.) No significant correlations exist between inservice training and pupil achievement.

About two-thirds of the teachers reported that they used the Follow Through resource rooms "often" during an average week. At the Bank Street site, 100% said they used the room often, in comparison to 23% at the Direct Instruction Model site. About half of the Follow Through teachers said they used the school library "often", ranging from 65% at Home-School Partnership site to 10% at smaller Behavior Analysis site, where the library is in another building. There were no significant correlations between teachers' use of resource rooms or libraries and pupil achievement.

The teachers' anonymous general comments will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5. However, it should be noted here among the results that most teachers spontaneously expressed great enthusiasm and support for Follow Through.

Results of the Second Grade Inventory

The children sampled from the Follow Through second grades had very high scores in the self-esteem inventory. (See Table 5.) Of a maximum possible score of 10, the boys' average was 8.5 and the

girls' was 8.6. (The sex difference was not significant.) There were no differences between schools. A sex-by-school interaction had borderline significance, suggesting that the boys in the Home-School Partnership school thought less highly of themselves than the girls there did (means of 7.75 and 8.94). At the Bank Street School this pattern was reversed, with the girls' mean of 8.07 and the boys' of 8.71.

Given the high means and low variances, significant correlations with achievement were not expected nor in fact were they found.

TABLE 5
AVERAGE SELF-ESTEEM SCORES (COGNITIVE AND INTERPERSONAL DIMENSIONS) FOR BOYS AND GIRLS IN EACH OF THE EIGHT MODELS (n=256)

		SEX		ROW MARGINALS
		BOY	GIRL	
D.I.M.				
	Mean	8.588	9.063	8.825
	SD	1.372	1.181	
B.S.M.				
	Mean	8.706	8.067	8.386
	SD	1.404	1.668	
B.A.M.				
	Mean	8.188	8.375	8.281
	SD	1.223	1.258	
B.A.M.				
	Mean	8.125	9.000	8.563
	SD	1.025	0.894	
C.O.C.				
	Mean	8.938	8.533	8.735
	SD	1.611	1.356	
H.S.P.				
	Mean	7.750	8.938	8.344
	SD	2.017	1.482	
S.S.M.				
	Mean	8.700	8.333	8.517
	SD	1.767	1.426	
I.L.M.				
	Mean	9.000	8.563	8.781
	SD	0.966	1.153	
COLUMN MARGINALS	Mean	8.499	8.609	8.554

Results of the Study of Health Services

Follow Through pupils receive far more extensive health services than do other public school pupils, and the Follow Through children receive those services much more frequently. The range of Follow Through health services includes annual screening, referral, and follow-up treatment of children's hearing, vision, and teeth, as well as complete physical examinations and immunizations for those who need them. The program, through the nurses and other Follow Through staff, makes contact with the agencies to which the children and their families are referred, confers with parents of children with special health needs, assists the parents in getting the children to treatment (for instance by providing babysitting), and even escorts the children to appointments if necessary. The Follow Through nurses give regular health workshops for parents, and also provide informal instruction to individual parents whenever a parent "drops in" to the nurse's office.

Tables 6 and 7 include the data on health services which exist in formal records. Many other services, including those mentioned above which do not appear in the Tables, are regularly provided to Follow Through children, as documented in the evaluators's site visit notes. Cumulative records of these services do not exist in quantifiable form, however.

Table 6 shows that Follow Through children receive extremely thorough screening annually for hearing, vision, and dental problems. The numbers referred indicate the numbers of problems

TABLE 6

SPECIAL HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDED
TO FOLLOW THROUGH CHILDREN
(Total Follow Through Enrollment in 8 sites: 2519)

	Children Screened		Referred	Treated[1]
	N	%	N	N
Hearing	2132	85	131	39
Vision	2606	103[2]	539	204
Dental	2371	94	1979	733
Complete Physical Exam	412[3]			

Notes:

1. Numbers indicate number of follow-up ships returned to nurses by parents. Many more children in fact received treatment.
2. Reflects turnover in pupil population during the course of the year.
3. Includes both examination for admission to school and examination by special referral. All Follow Through children received physical examinations prior to admission to school.

identified by the screening, and the evaluators' observations indicate that most of the children referred were treated, although many parents do not submit treatment completion slips. From the limited evidence available, the time lag between referral and submission of treatment completion slips for hearing averages approximately six weeks, and for vision problems it averages approximately five weeks.

Table 7 shows that non-Follow Through children do not receive the professional services documented in Table 6. Any screening for vision and hearing problems is done by the classroom teacher.

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF FOLLOW THROUGH AND NON-FOLLOW THROUGH SCHOOL HEALTH SERVICES[1]

	FOLLOW THROUGH CHILDREN	NON-FOLLOW THROUGH CHILDREN
Adult:Child		
Nurse:Child	1:315	1:4,087
Health Worker:Child[2]	1:209	1:2,994
Screening by Health Professional		
Vision	100%	0%[3]
Hearing	85%	0%[3]
Complete Physical on Admission	100%	85-90%[4]
Immunization	100%	85-90%[4]

Notes:

1. Data obtained from Public Health Service records for 1976-77.
2. Follow Through health workers include nurses, social workers, and paraprofessional family workers and family assistants. Non-Follow Through health workers include nurses, and paraprofessional Public Health Assistants.
3. Screening is to be done by classroom teachers.
4. Approximate

Table 7 also shows the striking difference between the ratios of nurses to children in Follow Through schools and in non-Follow Through schools. The difference is also evident when other health workers are added to the ratios. Finally, the fact is that 100% of the Follow Through children receive physical examination and immunization upon admission, while the percentage for non-Follow Through is lower. (The New York City Board of Education, in Special Circulars

No. 59 and 67, has established new procedures for admission beginning in September 1978, the goal of which is 100% completion of physical examinations and immunizations upon admission.)

The eight Follow Through nurses reported a total of 110 separate agencies which they contacted during 1977-78 for the support of their health programs. This is an average of 14 agencies per site. The nurses' records show that many of the agencies were contacted repeatedly, some as many as 10 to 20 times.

Parent Health Workshops were led by the Follow Through nurses at each of the eight schools throughout the year. A total of 84 workshops was reported, for an average of 10 per site. Frequent workshop topics were nutrition, children's diseases, diet and exercise, hypertension, breast and uterine cancer, child growth and development, and first aid.

Results of the Parent Questionnaire

The first part of the Parent Questionnaire dealt with the amount of parent participation in various Follow Through activities. A large number of the 505 parents who returned the questionnaire reported that they were active participants. (See Table 8.) The most frequent types of reported participation were visiting in the classroom (96%), visiting or helping in the Family Room or Parent Room (82%), going to PAC meetings or serving on committees (67%), attending health and nutrition workshops given by the Follow Through nurses (65%), attending parent training workshops (64%), attending Follow Through workshops on helping children in school (63%), and

taking children to the Follow Through nurse or other health services.

The second part of the Questionnaire dealt with parents' attitudes toward Follow Through. When asked about overall achievement, reading achievement, and self-esteem, well over 90% of the responding parents said they thought their children were doing better in Follow Through classes than they would in other classes. Over 80% of the parents also reported that they participated more in school activities than they otherwise would, and that their children got better health services because of Follow Through.

Asked to rate various aspects of the Follow Through program on a 5-point scale, two-thirds of the parents rated the reading program, and the effort to build self-esteem in the children as "superior" or "above average". On all other aspects of Follow Through which were included in the Questionnaire, over 50% of the ratings were "superior" or "above average".

Since the Questionnaire was anonymous, it was not possible to correlate parent activities and attitudes with school achievement.

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE OF 505 FOLLOW THROUGH PARENTS RESPONDING TO PARTICIPATION AND ATTITUDE QUESTIONS

Directions: Please put an X in front of each of the things that you have done.

1. Participating in children's classrooms

   96% a. Visiting in the classroom

   58% b. Going with the class on a trip

   55% c. Helping the teacher or the children in the class

   46% d. Making things for the classroom

   48% e. Preparing snacks with or for the children

2. Participating in other school activities

   82% a. Visiting or helping in the Family Room or Parent Room

   45% b. Helping in the Follow Through Office or other offices

   67% c. Going to PAC meetings or serving on committees

   57% d. Taking part in family activities such as family trips or family night meetings

   45% e. Being active in PTA

3. Using family services offered by Follow Through

   63% a. Taking children to the Follow Through nurse or other health services

   53% b. Going to see the Follow Through social worker, guidance counselor, or family assistant

   41% c. Receiving a home visit from someone in Follow Through

   49% d. Being referred to a community agency such as a dental clinic

TABLE 8 (Cont.)

4. Attending Parent Workshops

65% a. Health and nutrition workshops

56% b. Arts and crafts workshops

63% c. Workshops on helping children in school

64% d. Parent training workshops

21% e. Other workshops

5. Attending adult education with help from Follow Through

31% a. Receiving help in getting better jobs

27% b. Learning better English or Spanish

19% c. Going to high school courses

10% d. Going to college courses

23% e. Getting other education

If you have NOT been able to do ANY of the items from 1 through 5, is it because of:

Working	17%	Yes
Caring for young children at home	2%	Yes
Attending school	7%	Yes
Illness	7%	Yes

Please circle YES or NO for each of these questions:

99% YES 1. Do you think your child is doing better in his Follow Through class than he would in any other kind of class?

97% YES 2. Do you think the Follow Through Program helps your child think more highly of himself?

93% YES 3. Do you think your child reads better because of Follow Through?

82% YES 4. Do you participate more in school activities because of Follow Through?

80% YES 5. Does your child get better health service because of Follow Through?

TABLE 8 (Cont.)

Put an X under the word that describes these parts of Follow Through best:

	SUPERIOR	ABOVE AVERAGE	AVERAGE	BELOW AVERAGE	POOR
Reading Program	35%	33%	27%	2%	0%
Arithmetic Program	30%	35%	29%	2%	0%
Other Subjects	24%	35%	26%	2%	1%
Helping your child feel good about himself	36%	36%	26%	1%	1%
Dental care for your child	32%	29%	24%	2%	1%
Eye care for your child	30%	28%	24%	0%	0%
Other health care	28%	29%	25%	0%	0%
Parent workshops	30%	28%	25%	0%	0%
Other family services and activities	28%	28%	24%	0%	0%
Influence on the entire school	29%	23%	22%	0%	0%

Is there anything else you would like to say about the program?

CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION

The results of the Reading Achievement tests which are presented in Tables 1 and 4 are encouraging for the Follow Through Program. Of the 88 separate pre-to post-test comparisons in Table 1, 74 showed that the children matched or exceeded the normative rate of growth as indicated by either significantly greater-than-normal change or by the absence of significant pre-to post-test differences. Although 14 comparisons indicated slower than normal growth, 17 showed faster than normal development. It is especially noteworthy that this year's third grade children typically sustained a normal rate of growth as compared to the third graders of the previous two years, whose scores generally indicated significant relative losses. When one considers that the typical inner-city third grade child's test scores decline, these Follow Through results are particularly gratifying.

The small study comparing children who had had four full years of Follow Through to a group who had been in Follow Through for less than four years showed no significant difference but suffered from a methodological shortcoming. The "less-than-full Follow Through" group had had up to 3 1/2 years of Follow Through experience. In the 1978-79 evaluation study, the comparison between a "complete Follow Through" and a "partial Follow Through" group will be made again, but with the requirement that the "partial Follow Through" group have had two years or less of Follow Through experience.

The classroom observations indicated that a large proportion of the Follow Through children were having very positive school experiences, as evidenced by the following:

1) 85% of the pupils were observed to be working during time sampling observations, an improvement over last year.
2) Over 75% of the children were in classrooms in which the teachers and paraprofessionals were adhering to the instructional prescriptions of their models, again an improvement over 1976-77.
3) Over 75% of the children were in classes in which the effectiveness of instruction, regardless of model adherence, and the quality of the classroom environment, were rated "outstanding", or "very good" rather than "average" or "below average". This too is an improvement over last year.
4) 81% of the Follow Through teachers said that they liked Follow Through and, if given a choice, would remain in the program, even though in most cases it is more demanding of teachers' time and energy than non-Follow Through teaching.
5) In their anonymous general comments, most teachers spontaneously expressed great enthusiasm and support for Follow Through.
6) The second graders who were randomly selected to complete the Second Grade Inventory had very high self-esteem scores, with a mean of 8.55 out of 10 possible points.

The survey of the Follow Through health services documented the outstanding quality and broad range of health services for the Follow Through children and their families. Led by an excellent group of nurses, the health component of the Follow Through program is clearly one of the most important and effective. Special note should be made of the "health maintenance" or "illness prevention" aspects of the health program exemplified by the thorough screening-referral-treatment services, the parent health workshops, the program-wide emphasis on nutrition, and the close interaction between the nurses, the other Follow Through staff members, and the parents.

Five hundred and five Follow Through families responded to the Parent Questionnaire. This was a large return. But at the same time it must be understood that because the questionnaire was anonymous and voluntary, it cannot be assumed that those families represented an unbiased sample of the total Follow Through parent population. The parents reported frequent participation in a wide variety of Follow Through activities. Prominent among them were classroom visits, involvement in the Family Rooms, participation in the PAC's and PAC committees, and attending various Follow Through workshops.

The questionnaire return, which was unexpectedly large, was only one of the many indicators of the importance of the Parent Advisory Committees to Follow Through. Other contributions of the PAC's include organization of the Family Rooms, including the presentation of many special events there, recruitment of parents to work

as volunteers in classrooms, encouraging parents to take part in adult education and, in general, making the school an integral part of the community to which parents come freely.

Finally, on the Parent Questionnaire, the parents responded very enthusiastically when asked to rate various aspects of the Follow Through program. Most notable were their endorsements of their children's scholastic achievement, self-esteem, and overall growth and development, thanks to Follow Through. They further stated that because of Follow Through they participated more in school activities, and that their children received better health services because of Follow Through.

CHAPTER FIVE: RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Follow Through be continued for 1978-79. The basic aims of the program continue to be met, and improvements over 1976-77 were observed in many areas, as noted in the Results and Discussion chapters. Moreover, the recommendations from the 1976-77 Evaluation Report were by and large accepted and implemented. During the Fall of 1977, the evaluators met with the Center for School Development staff, the individual site coordinators, staff developers, and nurses and school principals. At these meetings, the implementation of the 1976-77 recommendations was discussed, and the objectives of this year's evaluation were reviewed. The evaluative visits in Spring 1978 corroborated the implementation of last year's recommendations, and also indicated that, on the whole, the objectives for 1977-78 were being met.

In general, this evaluation is to be considered as highly positive. The New York City Follow Through Program is continuing to progress. The recommendations which follow should help the total program and the individual sites to refine their effectiveness even further.

One overall recommendation is that every effort be made at all levels to assure that class sizes are as small as possible, particularly in the earlier grades. A recent survey of the research on this subject conducted by the Educational Research Service (New York Times, July 30, 1978) substantiates the belief that children

in the early grades, especially in inner-city schools, particularly benefit from smaller classes with individualized instruction.

At the two sites at which Follow Through Resource Centers were begun with separate funding in 1977-78, it seemed clear that some of the energies of the regular Follow Through staff were being diverted to the Resource Centers. While this is understandable and the Centers are indeed valuable, it is recommended that every effort be made to prevent a continuing drain on the resources available to the children at those sites.

Following are recommendations for the Follow Through programs at each site. They reflect the teachers' and other staff members' stated needs and recommendations as well as the evaluators' observations and interview findings.

The Direct Instruction Model Site

The recommendations from the 1976-77 Evaluation Report have been addressed and implemented successfully.

1. Pupil performance on the grade 1 Sentences subtest, and grade 2 and 3 Work Study Skills subtest, were below performances on the other subtests. It is recommended that the staff and sponsor analyze these tests and work toward appropriate curriculum revision.
2. Every attempt should be made to schedule the lunch period close to mid-day so that the morning learning time is not interrupted.

3. Work is needed on positive, short-term use of time-outs, rather than punitive, longer experiences for children with problem behavior.
4. Paraprofessionals need continuing help on reinforcing good and desirable behaviors, and especially on ignoring (rather than punishing) undesirable behavior.
5. A re-examination of the Kindergarten curriculum should be made to try to provide one or more long periods each week for traditional kindergarten activities.

The Bank Street Model Site

This continues to be a smoothly functioning model site. The recommendations from the 1976-77 evaluation have been met as much as possible.

1. Utilize the materials and ideas generated for the Resource Center fully in this school, so the Resource Center functions more as an added strength and less as a drain on current resources.
2. Heterogeniety of classes needs further reduction and the sponsor should be requested to focus on the children who are in the regular classes but apparently "need more structure".
3. Work is needed on in-class "mainstreaming-type" solutions for children with learning and behavior problems.

4. The classes should have regularly scheduled physical education periods.

The Behavior Analysis Model - Site A - 10 Classes

Every effort was made during 1977-78 to implement the recommendations of the previous year.

1. More time should be spent on science and social studies, into which reading can be integrated, thus allowing the reading period to be shortened.
2. The sponsor should be asked to work with the Kindergarten teachers to develop some less-structured or more "traditional early childhood" time for the Kindergartens. These need to be long time periods--not half an hour spqeezed in here and there.
3. Continued focus is needed on parent recruitment for classroom work and, especially, on good training of parent volunteers.

The Behavior Analysis Model - Site B, 8 Classes

This model continues to function quite well, and the recommendations from last year have been implemented successfully.

1. Continued focus is needed on parent recruitment for classroom work and, especially, on good training for parent volunteers.
2. More time should be spent on science and social studies, into which reading can be integrated, thus allowing the reading period to be shortened.

3. Utilize the development of the Resource Center for the school's own teachers, so that the Resource Center is enriching "at home," rather than being a drain.
4. Ask sponsor to work with Kindergarten teachers to develop some less-structured or more "traditional early childhood" time for Kindergarten classes.

The Cognitively Oriented Curriculum Model Site

Thanks to the Principals' stating last year's recommendations in terms of behavioral objectives, the recommendations were fully and successfully implemented. The achievement scores also improved markedly over last year.

1. Continued development of the model classrooms is recommended. They are coming along extremely well.
2. Staff and sponsor workshops should be focused on children with learning and behavior problems in classrooms, with the goal of keeping most of them in the classrooms in a "mainstreaming" sense.
3. Procedures should be formalized through which teachers can jointly order materials (including games) for their classrooms, and also share materials which they have developed.
4. Staff conferences should be held with the sponsor to review the requirements of individual differences among pupils. Attention needs to be given to the planning and evaluation phases.

5. Every effort should be made to recruit more parent volunteers.

The Home-School Partnership Model Site

Overall, achievement test scores at this site were better than last year, which is an encouraging sign. The two major recommendations about paraprofessionals' training and scheduling were met, and an attempt was made to implement the recommendation about notification of parents before paraprofessionals make visits. The recommendation about expansion of the resource room is repeated this year.

1. The Resource Room should be developed so that there would also be materials for the teachers to use in their classes, as well as for the paras to use on home visits.
2. The administration should experiment with the development and use of a check list for paras to use as part of their home visit reports, so that narrative reports would be briefer but that there would be ample space for written elaboration of individual details.
3. Procedures should be established for teachers to know a day in advance when paras are to be out of morning classrooms, either for absense or for meetings, etc.
4. Procedures and funding for ordering of supplies by teachers should be clarified with the Center for School Development.
5. The paperwork required of teachers should be studied in an effort to streamline it.

The Self-Sponsored Model Site

All of the recommendations from last year have been fully and successfully implemented at this site, which is apparently much more integrated and smooth-running than last year.

1. The teacher-let workshops, which have been very successful this year, should be continued.
2. The same Consultant as in 77-78 should be hired, and she should be asked to survey teachers, especially in upper grades, to help design her year's work.
3. Better communication is needed between the Follow Through program and the teachers of the upper grades.
4. Coordination is needed between the teachers and the support personnel in each classroom, so that teachers could diagnose problems and have the paraprofessional, parent volunteer, and/or student teacher implement the instruction. This is an area in which the Consultant could be helpful.

The Interdependent Learning Model Site

Major progress was made on implementing the extensive recommendations from last year into this year's program, and the program is functioning more smoothly this year.

1. All teachers and paras should be made aware of hours of availability of the Resource Room, and teachers should be asked for requests and suggestions for materials which should be purchased for the Resource Room.

2. The sponsor representative should work with the Kindergarten teachers, teacher trainer, coordinator, and principal to clarify and, if necessary, modify policies on reading in Kindergarten.
3. Staff and sponsor workshops should be focused on integrating "the problem child" into the self-contained, learning-centered classroom.
4. Work is needed to develop more parent volunteers to work in classrooms.

APPENDIX A

CLASS AND PUPIL EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SCHEDULE AND CHECK LIST

School _____ Class _____ Teacher _____

Room _____ Children on Register _____ Children Present _____ Date _____

Time ____ to ____ Adults Present: ___ Teacher ___ Para ___ Others (Note Numbers)

I. Record of numbers of children working and not working at three times, spaced 5 minutes apart. (Children working include those reading or writing or otherwise working at seats, those attending to teacher in large or small-group lessons, and those apparently otherwise engaged in school-related activities. Those not working include those day-dreaming, running around room, being distracted by others, and otherwise engaged in activities different from either teacher instructions or teacher-defined permissible activities.)

Time 1 _____ (AM/PM)	Time 2 _____ (AM/PM)	Time 3 _____ (AM/PM)
Number working _____	Working _____	Working _____
Number not working _____	Not working _____	Not working _____
Number indeterminate _____	Indeterminate _____	Indeterminate _____

II. Adherence to model

Teacher:	Para: (Where appropriate)
__ Adheres to model throughout	__ Adheres to model throughout
__ Usually adheres to model	__ Usually adheres to model
__ Sometimes adheres to model	__ Sometimes adheres to model
__ Never adheres to model	__ Never adheres to model

III. Effectiveness of instruction: Regardless of teacher's adherence to model (above), rate the effectiveness of instruction:

__ Outstanding

__ Very Good

__ Average

__ Below Average

IV. Quality of classroom environment: Rate this classroom according to the appropriateness and availability of materials in the classroom such as bulletin board displays, library books, children's work, special projects, etc.

___ Outstanding

___ Very Good

___ Average

___ Below Average

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE
Follow Through Evaluation, 1977-1978

INTERVIEWER: In response to the questions below, note the response of each teacher, recording verbatim comments where they apply. Use a separate questionnaire for each teacher interviewed.

Name of Teacher (for record-keeping and tallying of responses only; not to be included in Evaluation Report)

_____

School (in New York City) P.S. _____ Class _____ No. Pupils _____ (On Register)

1. How many years have you been a Follow Through Teacher? _____ Years

2. How many years have you been teaching, all together? _____ Years

3. Originally, did you want to be a Follow Through teacher? (If elaboration needed: If you had been given a choice, would you have chosen to join FT when you were assigned to it, or not?) _____
_____
_____

4. Now, how do you feel about the program: If you could choose, would you be a FT teacher or not? Why? _____
_____
_____

5. Did you have an orientation to the Follow Through program, either before you began teaching in it or shortly thereafter (i.e., in October, when you had entered in September)? _____

6. Approximately how many hours of inservice training have you had as a Follow Through teacher? Please include all workshops, both here at school and elsewhere (provided by the FT program), also hours spent with the Teacher Trainer in your class, grade conferences, and short sessions during your prep periods.

___ None
___ 1-7 hours, equiv. 1 full day
___ 8-14 hrs., or 2 days
___ 3-5 days
___ 6-7 days
___ 8-10 days
___ 2-3 weeks
___ 4 or more weeks

7. In an average week, how many times do you find materials from the Resource Room useful in your classroom? _____

8. In an average week, how many times do you find materials from the Library useful in your classroom? _____

9. What other things would you like to say, anonymously, about your experiences in Follow Through? _____
_____

CENTER FOR SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM

SECOND GRADE INVENTORY

Interviewer's Instructions:

Interviewer reads statement. "Is this like you?"

"Is this like you? Circle "yes" if you are like this or circle "no" if you are not like this".

Interviewer reads statement again. "Is this like you? Circle "yes" or "no"."

Part I: The Classroom and Me

1. I am a good reader.
2. I usually know the answer when my teacher asks a question.
3. I like when we do no work in school.
4. My drawing and painting is good.
5. I am a good thinker.
6. The kids in school like me.
7. My teacher likes me.
8. The kids in school want me to play with them.
9. The kids in school miss me when I am absent.
10. I like most of the kids in school.

Interviewer's Instructions:

"Zoe
"Moira
"Liv is a (boy, girl) in another school." (All the children in each group will be of the same sex and will hear statements read about children of their sex.)
"Diek
"Loris

Interviewer reads statement.

"Do you want to be like ___? Circle "yes" if you want to be like ___, or circle "no" if you do not want to be like ___."

CENTER FOR SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM

SECOND GRADE INVENTORY

Interviewer reads the statement again.

"Do you want to be like ___? Circle "yes" or "no"."

Part II: Children in School

1. Zoe is a good reader.
2. Moira usually knows the answer when (his, her) teacher asks a question.
3. Liv likes when (he, she) does new work in school.
4. Diek's drawing and painting is good.
5. Loris is a good thinker.
6. The kids in school like Zoe.
7. Moira's teacher likes (him, her).
8. The kids in school want Liv to play with them.
9. The kids in school miss Diek when (he, she) is absent.
10. Loris likes most of the kids in school.

APPENDIX B

ADDITIONAL DATA ANALYSIS TABLES

TABLE 9

Percent of Students Working at Observation Time 1 for Each of 8 Models

	Model								
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM	
MEAN	83.046	85.780	80.975	85.717	93.456	89.958	86.055	87.557	
SD	2.492	10.585	8.142	10.749	3.876	6.728	8.981	11.014	
N	346	459	278	230	274	263	235	188	
GRAND MEAN									86.568

TABLE 10

Percent of Students Working at Observation Time 2 for Each of 8 Models

	Model								
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM	
MEAN	85.168	88.490	76.558	74.230	94.204	88.243	83.349	82.686	
SD	8.038	8.367	8.031	16.902	4.742	11.200	10.562	11.512	
N	346	459	278	230	274	263	235	188	
GRAND MEAN									84.116

TABLE 11

Percent of Students Working at Observation Time 3 for Each of 8 Models

	Model								
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM	
MEAN	87.864	86.754	73.982	78.239	93.219	81.593	85.200	86.877	
SD	10.015	6.892	11.941	18.027	6.205	15.548	12.204	13.141	
N	346	459	278	230	274	263	235	188	
GRAND MEAN									84.216

THE GRAND MEAN IS AN UNWEIGHTED AVERAGE OF THE CELL MEANS.

TABLE 12

Percent of Students Where "Teacher Adheres to Model" for Each of 7 Models

	Model						
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	SSM	ILM
"NEVER OR SOME"	10.5	6.5	25.9	13.5	28.1	0.	0.
"USUALLY OR ALWAYS"	89.5	93.5	74.1	86.5	71.9	100.	100.
N	313	459	278	230	274	235	195

TABLE 13

Percent of Students Where "Para Adheres to Model" for Each of 7 Models

	Model						
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	SSM	ILM
"NEVER OR SOME"	13.1	7.0	37.1	0.	17.5	5.9	0.
"USUALLY OR ALWAYS"	86.9	93.0	62.9	100.	82.5	94.1	100.
N	313	459	278	230	274	235	195

HSP has no formal model.

TABLE 14

Percent "Effectiveness of Instruction" for Each of 8 Models

	Model							
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM
"BELOW OR AVERAGE"	17.9	24.4	25.9	37.4	17.5	15.1	17.0	39.5
"VERY GOOD OR OUTSTANDING"	82.1	75.6	74.1	62.6	82.5	84.9	83.0	60.5
N	346	459	278	230	274	292	235	195

TABLE 15

Percent "Quality of Classroom Environment" for Each of 8 Models

	Model							
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM
"BELOW OR AVERAGE"	36.7	12.6	69.4	27.0	0.	23.6	18.3	26.2
"VERY GOOD OR OUTSTANDING"	63.3	87.4	30.6	73.0	100.	76.4	81.7	73.8
N	346	459	278	230	274	292	235	195

TABLE 16

Mean Years of Teaching for Each of 8 Models

	Model							
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM
MEAN	10.416	9.386	11.940	15.570	11.605	15.134	13.285	13.806
SD	4.440	4.033	4.524	8.772	5.773	5.671	5.116	5.217
N	346	459	251	230	301	292	235	188

GRAND MEAN 12.642

TABLE 17

Mean Years Follow Through Teaching for Each of 8 Models

	Model							
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM
MEAM	3.621	5.626	3.020	2.525	3.647	5.784	4.749	6.017
SD	2.727	2.835	1.767	1.469	2.535	2.993	2.906	2.714
N	346	396	251	198	278	292	235	188

GRAND MEAN 4.373

THE GRAND MEAN IS AN UNWEIGHTED AVERAGE OF THE CELL MEANS.

TABLE 18

Percent of Teachers who Chose Follow Through at the Beginning for Each of 8 Models

	Model							
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM
YES	44.9	80.3	41.7	100.	63.1	18.1	100.	79.3
NO	55.1	19.7	58.3	0.	36.9	81.9	0.	20.7

TABLE 19

"If You Had a Choice, Would You Stay in Follow Through?" for Each of 8 Models

	Model							
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM
NEGATIVE	23.1	6.2	20.	12.5	0.	8.3	0.	44.4
NEUTRAL	0.	0.	0.	12.5	10.	16.7	0.	0.
POSITIVE	76.9	93.8	80.	75.	90.	75.	100.	55.6

TABLE 20

Percent "Had Orientation to Program?" for Each of 8 Models

	Model							
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM
YES	78.9	71.2	56.6	86.5	71.9	54.1	57.9	80.0
NO	21.1	28.8	43.4	13.5	28.1	45.9	42.1	20.0

TABLE 21

Percent of Teachers Having Different Amounts of "Inservice Training" for each of 8 Models

	Model							
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM
0-14 HRS.	33.5	17.0	35.9	12.6	8.0	48.4	25.1	12.4
3-10 DAYS	24.0	17.2	51.8	45.7	30.3	10.0	9.8	18.4
2-4+ WEEKS	42.5	65.8	12.3	41.7	61.7	41.6	65.1	67.2

TABLE 22

Percent of "Resource Room Use" for Each of 8 Models

	Model							
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM
NEVER/SOME	77.0	0.	45.0	48.7	36.2	60.6	11.9	61.5
OFTEN	23.0	100.	55.0	51.3	63.8	39.4	88.1	38.5

TABLE 23

Percent of "Library Use" for Each of 8 Models

	Model							
	DIM	BSM	BAM 1	BAM 2	COC	HSP	SSM	ILM
NEVER/SOME	73.0	41.4	48.6	89.9	53.2	34.6	39.1	48.2
OFTEN	27.0	58.6	51.4	10.1	46.8	65.4	60.9	51.8

TABLE 24

CORRELATIONS OF CLASSROOM OBSERVATION AND TEACHER INTERVIEW MEASURES WITH PUPIL READING GAIN SCORES AND SELF-ESTEEM MEASURES

	Grade and Reading Test										Self-Esteem Measure			
	K		1			2			3			2		
Classroom & Teacher Variables	Ltr	Aur	Ltr	Aur	Sent	Voc	Comp	WSS	Voc	Comp	WSS	Cog	Aff	Art	TOT
Percent Working at Time 1	.15	.01	.06	.07	.18	-.14	-.03	-.03	-.07	-.15	-.09	-.02	-.09	.12	-.08
Percent Working at Time 2	.12	-.08	.06	.26	.21	.01	.01	.00	-.06	.03	.03	-.05	-.08	.13	-.09
Percent Working at Time 3	.19	.01	.05	.12	.14	-.05	-.02	.05	.02	.05	.02	.01	-.10	.08	-.07
Teacher Adheres to Model	.12	.08	.09	.02	-.03	-.10	.01	.01	.01	.06	.00	-.11	-.16	-.11	-.18
Para Adheres to Model	.15	.08	.12	.05	.02	-.09	.06	.09	.07	.08	.02	.05	.01	-.02	.03
Quality of Teaching	.12	.15	.02	.12	.09	-.02	.07	.04	-.09	-.09	-.02	-.05	-.12	.08	-.11
Quality of Environment	-.10	.08	.10	.10	.15	-.10	.06	.09	-.01	.08	.02	-.04	-.07	.00	-.07
Years of FT Teaching	.08	.06	.03	.10	.11	.09	.01	.05	-.11	.03	.10	.09	.05	.07	.09
Total Years of Teaching	.11	.31	-.01	-.16	-.03	.05	.05	-.06	.00	.05	.15	.02	.10	-.08	.08
Attitude Toward FT	.15	.18	.12	.10	.11	.16	.17	.09	.14	.19	.18	.10	.07	.09	.12
Chose FT	.00	-.04	.17	.06	.04	.21	.14	-.14	.06	-.08	-.11	.02	.09	.05	.07
Had FT Orientation	-.02	-.04	-.06	.04	.10	.11	.00	.00	-.06	-.08	-.11	.06	.06	.03	.08
Amount of In-service Training	.18	-.09	.04	.16	.13	.08	.00	.11	-.06	-.07	-.08	-.02	.04	-.07	.02
Resource Room Use	.03	.00	.04	.11	.02	.00	-.14	.04	-.10	.06	.01	.02	.01	-.01	.02
Library Use	.03	.21	-.06	.08	-.02	.01	.00	.07	.05	.05	-.02	-.10	-.11	-.07	-.14

Ltr = Letters
Aur = Aural
Sent = Sentences
Voc = Vocabulary
Comp = Comprehension
WSS = Word Study Skills
Cog = Cognitive
Aff = Affective
Art = Artistic
TOT = Cognitive + Affective

72

71